not have any antecedent basis issue beyond that addressed in claim 4. Thus, claims 4 and 5 are in conditions for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki et al. (5,418,969). This rejection is moot as a result of the above-mentioned claim cancellations.

Claims 2, 3, 8-13, and 15-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected based claim. The cancellations of the above-mentioned claims overcome the objection as to claims 3, 8, and 15-16. As for claims 2, 9-13, and 17, Applicants kindly submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Specifically, claim 2 is dependent on claim 20, which is a proper independent claim that has been allowed. Likewise, claims 9-12 are dependent on claim 23, which is a proper and allowed independent claim. Claim 13 is dependent on claim 12, which is dependent on proper independent claim 23. Claim 17 is dependent on claim 24, which is a proper and allowed independent claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are allowable and request that the application be passed to issue. The Examiner is invited to directly contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,
EDMUND CHEUNG *ET AL.*

Dated: January 9, 2003

By: _____
Nathan S. Huynh, Reg. No. P-53,052
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7211
Fax: (650) 938-5200

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

4. (Twice Amended) The system of claim 20, wherein the circuitry for [dynamically and automatically] selecting one of the plurality of clocks for the resource responsive to the estimated total bandwidth utilization comprises:

a multiplexer having a plurality of inputs for receiving the plurality of clocks and a selection input for receiving a selection value determined in response to the estimated total bandwidth utilized by the zero or more controllers accessing the resource.

B